REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough review of the present application, and respectfully request reconsideration in light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1-5 are pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended to require that the pulsation pressure reduction conduit have a single inlet led to the discharge chamber. Amended claim 1 further positively recites that the single inlet is positioned at a position at which the pressure pulsations of the discharged gas at the respective discharge holes are substantially equal, said position of said single inlet depending on relative positions of the discharge holes in the discharge chamber, an overall configuration of the discharge chamber, and a volume of space occupied by the pulsation pressure reduction conduit in the discharge chamber. The newly added claim limitations find solid support in the application as filed, e.g., FIG. 4 and the specification at page 6, lines 16-22. No new matter has been introduced through the foregoing amendments.

The Examiner's repeated *35 U.S.C. 103(a)* rejection of claims 1-5 as being obvious over *Suzuki* (U.S. Patent No. 4,930,995) in view of *Ahn* (U.S. Patent No. 6,568,914) is traversed for the reasons advanced in the previous Responses filed April 20, 2005 and January 12, 2005 which are incorporated herein by reference. Solely for the purpose of expediting prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claim 1, as detailed above, to further define the claimed invention over the art. The amendments were not necessitated by the Examiner's rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 is clearly patentable over the applied references, because the references singly or in combination fail to teach or suggest the main features of the claimed invention, i.e., ① a pulsation pressure reduction conduit having ② a single inlet leading to the discharge chamber with ③ the position of the inlet being such that the pressure pulsations of the discharged gas at the respective discharge holes are substantially equal. These distinctions between the claimed invention and the applied references have been discussed in detail in the previous

PAGE 6/11 * RCVD AT 8/30/2005 10:44:11 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/29 * DNIS:2734814 * CSID: * DURATION (mm-ss):04-14

Responses, especially the Response filed April 20, 2005, and, therefore, will not be explained again herein for the sake of simplicity.

The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to requirement ③ of amended claim 1, i.e., the position of the inlet being such that the pressure pulsations of the discharged gas at the respective discharge holes are substantially equal. Currently, there is no evidence of record showing that the Examiner's proposed combined device of *Suzuki* and *Ahn*, if proper, would include such a unique feature of the claimed invention.

Applicants note that the Examiner relies on FIG. 2(b) of *Suzuki* for claim limitation ③. Although FIG. 2(b) of *Suzuki* appears to disclose that the distances between discharge holes 13a and inlet 13c are equal, the distances are actually not equal. As can be seen in FIG. 2(c) and disclosed at column 4, lines 37-40 of *Suzuki*, the respective cavities 13(b) in the *Suzuki* device are formed with different depths. That means, the actual distance the discharged gas has to travel from the upper discharge hole 13(a) in FIG. 2(c) through upper passage 13(d) to inlet 13(c) is different from that between the lower discharge hole 13(a) in FIG. 2(c) through lower passage 13(d) to inlet 13(c). The configuration of FIGs. 2(a)-2(c) is equivalent to and consistent in principle with the configuration of FIGs. 1(a)-(b) of *Suzuki* in which inlet 13(c) is located at different radially spaced intervals from discharge holes 13(a)/(b). *See Suzuki* at FIG. 1(b) and column 4, lines 13-21. Thus, *Suzuki* explicitly requires that the actual distances between the discharge holes and the inlet be different. Since the actual distances are different, there is no disclosure or suggestion by *Suzuki* that the pressure pulsations of the discharged gas at the discharge holes are substantially equal as presently claimed.

In addition, even if the distances between the discharge holes and the inlet of *Suzuki* are considered to be equal, it is not necessary that the *Suzuki* inlet is located at a position at which the pressure pulsations of the discharged gas at the respective discharge holes are also equal. As disclosed in the specification of the instant application at page 6, lines 16-22, and explained in the

PAGE 7/11 * RCVD AT 8/30/2005 10:44:11 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/29 * DNIS:2734814 * CSID: * DURATION (mm-ss):04-14

Response filed April 20, 2005, at *Exhibit D* and page 4, the first full paragraph, the "equal pressure pulsation" position of the inlet depends on numerous factors, including (i) the relative positions of the respective discharge holes, (ii) the overall configuration of the discharge chamber, and (iii) the volume of space occupied by the pulsation pressure reduction conduit inside the discharge chamber. In other words, the allegedly "central" position of the *Suzuki* inlet does not necessarily satisfy the "equal pressure pulsation" requirement of the claimed invention, and therefore, does not constitute an enabling disclosure of the claimed inlet's position where the pressure pulsations of the discharged gas from the discharge holes are substantially equal.

It should be now clear that the Examiner's proposed combination of *Suzuki* and *Ahn*, if proper, would fail to teach or disclose limitation ③ of claim 1.

The Examiner's proposed combination would also fail to teach or disclose newly added claim limitation (iii), i.e., the "equal pressure pulsation" position of the inlet depends on, among other things, a volume of space occupied by the pulsation pressure reduction conduit in the discharge chamber. None of the applied references are concerned with the position of the inlet, and therefore, the references do not supply a disclosure or suggestion of the importance of taking into account the volume of space occupied by the pulsation pressure reduction conduit in the discharge chamber in determining the inlet's position.

In summary, independent claim 1 is not obvious over *Suzuki* and *Ahn* because:

A. the references are not properly combinable in the manner the Examiner proposes, as argued in the Response filed January 12, 2005, at page 4;

B. the references combined in the manner the Examiner proposes would fail to teach or disclose each and every element of the claim, namely:

a. original limitations ①, ② and ③, especially limitation ③, i.e., the

PAGE 8/11 * RCVD AT 8/30/2005 10:44:11 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/29 * DNIS:2734814 * CSID: * DURATION (mm-ss):04-14

single inlet of the pulsation pressure reduction conduit is positioned at a position at which the pressure pulsations of the discharged gas at the respective discharge holes are substantially equal; and

b. new limitations (i), (ii), and (iii), especially limitation (iii), i.e., the position of the inlet depends on a volume of space occupied by the pulsation pressure reduction conduit in the discharge chamber.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, and are considered patentable at least for the reasons advanced with respect to amended claim 1.

Withdrawal of the *35 U.S.C. 103(a)* rejection of claims 1-5 in view of the above amendments and arguments is believed appropriate and therefore respectfully requested.

Each of the Examiner's rejection and objection has been traversed/overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Early and favorable indication of allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

PAGE 9/11 * RCVD AT 8/30/2005 10:44:11 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/29 * DNIS:2734814 * CSID: * DURATION (mm-ss):04-14

Application No.: 10/648,250 **Docket No.: 2729-162**

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP

Randy A. Noranbrock
Registration No. 42,940

for: Benjamin J. Hauptman
Registration No. 29,310

USPTO Customer No. 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 310
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 684-1111 BJH/KL/klb
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: August 8, 2005

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS BEING FACSIMILE TRANSMITTED TO THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE ON THE DATE SHOWN BELOW

Kindra Bryant
TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PERSON SIGNING CERTIFICATION

SIGNATURE **DATE** August 8, 2005

571-273-8300
FACSIMILE NUMBER

PAGE 10/11 * RCVD AT 8/30/2005 10:44:11 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/29 * DNIS:2734814 * CSID: * DURATION (mm-ss):04-14